

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

Filed: April 18, 2023

\* \* \* \* \*

IN RE: RAJ K. PATEL

\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*

Case No. 23-7028

\* \* \* \* \*

## ORDER

On March 27, 2023, Mr. Patel filed a motion for leave to initiate a new civil action. See Motion, ECF No. 5. Mr. Patel, who is barred from filing complaints in the United States Court of Federal Claims absent an order from the undersigned granting leave to file them, see Orders, Patel v. United States, No. 22-1446 (Fed. Cl. Nov. 17, 2022; Dec. 9, 2022), ECF Nos. 14, 16 (“anti-filing injunctions”), states that his new civil action would raise “claims under the Act of Congress and under the Big Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1491, substantiated by Ordered Liberty, Civil RICO, illegal exaction, Taking, and other claims.” ECF No. 5 at 1. Mr. Patel does not otherwise explain how the new action would “raise[] new matters properly before the Court” as is required by the anti-filing injunctions.

As was the case with Mr. Patel’s first motion for leave, the instant motion contains no cognizable explanation as to how the allegations in the complaint he proposes to file raise new matters that fall within the jurisdiction of the Court of Federal Claims. Accordingly, leave to file Mr. Patel’s March 27, 2023, submission is DENIED. To the extent that Mr. Patel moves the undersigned to modify the anti-filing injunctions, that motion is also DENIED for the reasons set forth in the undersigned’s January 5, 2023, Order addressing the same issue. See ECF No. 1.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ELAINE D. KAPLAN  
Chief Judge